

COUNTY OF TULARE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COUNTY CIVIC CENTER, COURTHOUSE ROOM 111
VISALIA, CALIFORNIA 93291

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1994

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

JULY 11, 1995

PREPARED BY:

MARY E. BEATIE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

COUNTY OF TULARE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
County Civic Center, Courthouse Room 111
Visalia, California 93291

- ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1994 -

Presented in Compliance with Section 65400
of the California Government Code

Presented to the Board of Supervisors
July 11, 1995

Prepared by:
Mary E. Beatie, Assistant Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following Planning and Development Department Staff are graciously acknowledged for their contributions and assistance in the preparation of this report.

George Finney

Jim Brown

Dave Bryant

Dave Dean

Jim Van Deusen

Bill Balsley

Tim Battin

Karen Edwards

Wayne Clausen

Catherine Andersen

Beverly Cates

Andrew Remus

Jennifer Munn

Mark Clark

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
ANNUAL REPORT - 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

SECTIONS I. & II.: ANNUAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - JULY 11, 1995

SECTION I.

| | |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION | i |
| A. DEPARTMENT DUTIES | 1 |
| B. PROGRAM BUDGET | 2 |
| C. WORKLOAD STATISTICS | 3 |
| 1. 2300 LAFCO | 3 |
| 2. 3110 PLANNING | 4 |
| 3. 3120 BUILDING | 6 |
| 4. 3121 EMPLOYEE HOUSING | 7 |
| 5. 3125 ABANDONED VEHICLE ABATEMENT. | 9 |
| 6. 3140 TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS . . . | 9 |
| 7. 3150 REDEVELOPMENT. | 10 |
| 8. GRANTS. | 10 |
| D. GIS IMPLEMENTATION. | 11 |

SECTION II. (ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 65400 OF THE CALIFORNIA
GOVERNMENT CODE - As submitted to State Housing & Community
Development and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)

(See separate Table of Contents Page 12)

APPENDIX

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Department Organizational Chart | 1.1 |
| 2. List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject . . . | 2.1 |
| 3. Constraints to the Provision of Housing. | 3.1 |
| 4. Employee Housing Act Annual Report to the State Department. . | 4.1 |
| of Housing and Community Development | |

COUNTY OF TULARE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
- ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1994 -

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared to satisfy three purposes:

1. Section 65400 of the California Government Code requires Planning Departments to report annually to the Board of Supervisors, the State Housing and Community Development Department and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on the status of the County's general plan and the progress in its implementation, including a discussion on the progress in meeting the County's share of regional housing needs, as determined pursuant to Government Code Section 65584 and local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) of Section 65583. SECTION II of this report was submitted to the specified state agencies on July 10, 1995, and is hereby submitted to the Board of Supervisors in fulfillment of this statutory requirement. Information and data in this Section is based upon the calendar year.
2. SECTION I fulfills the Department's tradition of annually presenting to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission additional information relevant to the Department's duties and authorities, staffing, and budget along with information specific to the Department's current and projected activities. Some information in this Section covers the first 6 months of calendar year 1995.
3. Lastly, this report serves as written documentation in support of an oral presentation about the department required by the County Administrative Officer to be made to the Board of Supervisors on July 11, 1995.

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

- ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1994 -

SECTION I.

A. DEPARTMENT DUTIES:

As its primary role, the Planning and Development Department performs those functions delegated to planning agencies under the Planning and Zoning Law including, but not limited to preparation and maintenance of the General Plan, implementation of the General Plan through zoning and subdivision ordinances, etc. In addition, the Department is assigned the lead role for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act on public and private projects, implementation and enforcement of the State Building Standards, Employee Housing Act and abatement of abandoned vehicles. The Department also provides staff to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), the Tulare County Redevelopment Agency (TCRA) and the Tulare County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The Department serves as the Chair to the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC), the County Zoning Administrator (ZA) and the County Environmental Assessment Officer for all public and private projects except those originating in the Public Works Department.

In order to accomplish these programs, the Department is allocated 60 positions of which there are 56 full-time positions and one project service position (GIS Coordinator). In addition, there are seven (11%) full time positions which are currently frozen and are not funded in the current budget. The Department is also allocated five part-time positions of which two are currently frozen and unfunded.

The chart in APPENDIX A. illustrates the organizational structure of the Department and reflects organizations which took place during 1993*. The Department is now comprised of seven separate divisions:

- Building and Zoning Inspection
- Clerical Support
- Countywide Planning
- Environmental Assessment
- Information Systems
- Project Review
- Redevelopment and Grants

A more complete list of functions mandated to local planning agencies by the Planning and Zoning Law can be provided if needed.

PROGRAM BUDGET:

A summary of the Department's budget by budget organizations is as follows:

Expenditures

| <u>Org</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>95-96</u> ¹ |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| 2300 (LAFCO) | 54,725 | 56,664 | 64,695 |
| 3110 (Planning) | 1,325,364 | 1,414,332 | 1,519,855 |
| 3120 (Building) | 711,138 | 784,932 | 858,970 |
| 3121 (Employee Housing) | -0- | 44,685 | 99,552 |
| 3125 (Abandoned Vehicles) | 47,374 | 59,006 | 75,948 |
| 3140 (TCAG) | 129,391 | 139,078 | 142,839 |
| 3150 (Redevelopment) | 185,418 | 255,563 | 302,128 |
| (Grants) | 334,620 | 655,896* | 646,294 |
| TOTAL | 2,788,030 | 3,410,156 | 3,710,281 |

Revenues

| <u>Org</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>95-96</u> ¹ |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| 2300 (LAFCO) | 25,000 | 41,174 | 43,101 |
| 3110 (Planning) | 551,838 | 565,249 | 649,100 |
| 3120 (Building) | 808,278 | 810,559 | 1,074,000 |
| 3121 (Employee Housing) | -0- | 48,212 | 73,844 |
| 3125 (Abandoned Vehicles) | 46,488 | 60,325 | 100,306 |
| 3140 (TCAG) | 128,404 | 142,494 | 143,655 |
| 3150 (Redevelopment) | 182,767 | 255,563 | 339,068 |
| (Grants) | 504,467 | 654,996* | 646,294 |
| TOTAL | 2,247,587 | 2,578,572 | 3,069,368 |

The Department budget for 1995/96 proposes two new positions in clerical and accounting functions as well as a new Building and Zoning Inspector I/II and a Planner I/II to enhance the department's code enforcement efforts in zoning, building, employee housing, abandoned vehicles, and dangerous buildings, completion of the replacement of the Department's HP 3000 computer system, development of four new Redevelopment project areas and abatement of least 25 structures under the County's Dangerous Buildings Ordinance. Funding for these new expenditures would come from new fees under the Uniform Building Code (40% increase proposed), early repayment of County loans to the Redevelopment Agency, increased Planning fees and more effective procedures to reimburse County costs for services such as mitigation monitoring under CEQA. Other sources include funding from contingencies (i.e. for Dangerous Buildings Abatement) and grants (i.e. for economic development).

¹ As of February, 1995

* \$900 to be matched by 3110

WORKLOAD STATISTICS:

The following summarizes the workload statistics and staffing information for each budget organization in the Department. Detailed letters of justification and work programs for each division can be made available if needed.

1. 2300 LAFCO

LAFCO is an independent agency mandated by State law to coordinate changes in local boundaries, streamline governmental structure and prepare Spheres of Influence for each city and special district in the County. The Commission considers requests for changes of organization such as annexation, detachment, incorporation of cities, formation of special districts, etc. LAFCO also conducts special studies of issues related to its authority and most recently was authorized by AB 1335 to regulate extension of services outside city/district boundaries.

Staffing and workload statistics for LAFCO are as follows:

LAFCO Staffing

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| Support Staff | .3 | .3 | .3 |
| TOTAL | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.5 |

LAFCO Caseload

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Projected 95-96</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Changes of Organization | 11 | 19 | 18 |
| Sphere Amendments | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Special Studies | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Extraterritorial Service Agreements | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 29 | 28 |

While workload statistics have remained fairly constant in recent years, we expect an increase next year attributable to Spheres of Influence studies resulting from the Commission's new Sphere policy and a number of dissolution/consolidation studies which are likely to be proposed.

2. 3110 PLANNING

The staffing and workload statistics for each of the principal planning divisions is summarized in the following tables.

Planning Staffing:

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Project Review</u> | | | |
| Planners | 6.3 | 6.3 | 7.3 |
| Technicians | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Support Staff | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| <u>Countywide</u> | | | |
| Planners | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Technicians | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Support Staff | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| <u>Env. Assessment</u> | | | |
| Planners | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Technicians | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Support Staff | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| TOTAL | 19.6 | 19.6 | 22.8 |

Workload statistics: Project Review Division

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| General Plan Amendments | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Ag Pres. Cancellations | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Ag Pres. Formations | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Cert. of Compliance | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| Development Agreements | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Lot Line Adjust. | 82 | 85 | 89 |
| Parcel Map | 97 | 100 | 105 |
| Special Use Permit | 140 | 140 | 147 |
| Site Plan Review | 18 | 20 | 21 |
| Setback Variance | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Planned Unit Develop. | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Change of Zone | 10 | 14 | 15 |
| Zone Variance | 31 | 35 | 37 |
| Subdivisions | 7 | 12 | 13 |
| Minor Modifications | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| Time Extensions | 12 | 15 | 16 |
| SUBTOTAL | 472 | 502 | 526 |
| Misc. Referrals* | 68 | 70 | 74 |
| TOTAL | 540 | 572 | 600 |

Workload trends in the Project Review Division are expected to remain fairly constant although a slight (5%) increase can be expected due to improved economic conditions.

Workload Statistics: Countywide Planning Division

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| General Plan Amendments | 1 | 2 | 3-6 |
| ALUC Referrals | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Comm. Rezoning Projects | 2 | 1 | 2-4 |
| Specific Planning Studies | 6 | 10 | 8 |
| Planning Papers | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 29 | 29 | 30-35 |

As the Countywide Planning Division is responsible for most of the long-range planning functions for the County, its workload statistics are not well reflected by a numerical chart such as above. A better description of the various projects underway in the division is contained in the work

* Misc. referrals include but are not limited to General Plan Referrals, ABC referrals, kennel licenses, adult care facilities and nonrenewal of ag preserve contracts.
program/letter of justification for the division. Major work elements

planned for 1995/96 include completion of community plans for Pixley and Poplar-Cotton Center, updating of Urban Boundaries around all the incorporated cities, completion of the Circulation Element revision and implementation of the recommendations contained in the 1994 Agricultural Advisory Committee Report.

Workload Statistics: Environmental Assessment Division

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Environmental reviews | 472 | 514 | 525 |
| Surface Mining/ Reclamation Plans | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| House Numbering Amendments | 14 | 9 | 10 |
| Area Planning Studies | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| EIR's | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Fast Tracking Cases | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mitigation Monitoring Reviews | 5 | 15 | 25 |
| TOTAL | 506 | 553 | 571 |

All planning cases are reviewed by this division for CEQA compliance. The division is also responsible for enforcement of SMARA, road and house numbering projects and completion of area plans for the mountainous territory of the County. With completion of the mining committee work expected by the end of this fiscal year, it's anticipated that the major work to be undertaken in this division next year will be implementation of the mining committee recommendations and ongoing work on the mountain area planning process. In addition, two major mining applications are expected to be submitted shortly.

3. 3120 BUILDING:

The 3120 Building Inspection program consists of building inspections and plan checking services for all types of building permits, including relocation and demolition permits and enforcement of building and zoning codes for building permits. Inspection services are also provided for substandard housing. Contract services with Farmersville and Exeter for building permit processing and inspections are also provided.

The staffing and workload statistics for the Building Inspection program are summarized in the following tables:

Building Staffing

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Building Inspectors | 9.9 | 9.7 | 10 |
| Plan Checkers | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Support Staff | 5 | 5 | 6.2 |
| TOTAL | 16.8 | 16.2 | 18.1 |

Workload Statistics

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Residential | 305 | 325 | 341 |
| Non-residential ¹ | 374 | 392 | 411 |
| Other ² | 794 | 833 | 840 |
| Non-classified ³ | 257 | 269 | 283 |
| Demolitions | 522 | 548 | 575 |
| Total | 2352 | 2367 | 2450 |

The slump in construction due to the recession appears to have stabilized. A slight upturn is forecast based on current economic forecasts for the State and recent announcements that no further hikes in the prime interest rate are planned.

A major program in the Building Division is the Dangerous Building Abatement Program. Of the \$69,058 budgeted for this program for 94/95, it is expected that \$67,140.00 will be spent. About 7-8 owners, when faced with the prospect of having to pay the County for demolitions, decided to remove the buildings themselves, or they pulled permits to rebuild and fix the buildings. The Board has previously been provided a list of buildings demolished within their respective districts.

4. 3121 EMPLOYEE HOUSING:

Tulare County assumed enforcement of the State Employee Housing Act (EHA) on July 1, 1994. The intent was to allow the County to identify and inspect illegal employee housing in the County, insure that the facilities

¹ includes typical commercial and industrial buildings, churches, schools, public works and utility buildings, hospitals and other institutional buildings

² includes demolitions, additions and alterations, and residential non-housekeeping buildings

³ includes all other permits not otherwise classified

comply with County zoning and building codes, and promote better living conditions in these facilities. It was anticipated that administration of the program would be phased in over a two year period. Staffing and workload statistics for the program are shown in the following tables:

EHA Staffing

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | N/A | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Inspectors | N/A | 1.2 | 2.7 |
| Support Staff | N/A | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| TOTAL | N/A | 2.6 | 4.6 |

EHA Caseload

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| New Permits | N/A | -0- | 20 |
| Inspections, Abatements | N/A | 160 | 300 |
| TOTAL | N/A | 160 | 320 |

From July 1, 1994 to June 26, 1995 the following can be reported:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Fines and Fees collected | \$41,240.00 |
| Money owed by identified camps (violations) | 14,280.00 |
| Money owed by old camps soon to be occupied this season) | 340.00 |

45 new facilities have been identified
 5 new facility owners came in on their own
 87 applications for 1995 Permits to Operate (PO) have been received
 12 facilities have received Permits to Operate
 75 facilities need further inspections before a PO can be issued
 67 Certificates of Non-Operation were filed for 1995

Three facilities are being turned over to County Counsel for failing to comply. Fifteen Second Notice of Violation and Order to Correct have been sent out.

Activities of the first 6 months of the program were handled by one full time administrator (Planner III), one full time clerical, and one part time inspector. A great deal of time was spent obtaining State files and other relevant information necessary to get started. A lot of clean up work on the State's files was needed to get them in order to begin determining the precise status of the State identified sites. With the assistance of a full time inspector for the last 6 months, the program has picked up momentum. Despite the slow start up, the program was quite successful in its first year, collecting \$41,240.00 of the estimated \$48,000.00 in fines and fees.

Attached as APPENDIX D is a copy of the full annual report required to be filed with the State on the Employee Housing Program. The report was filed on May 11, 1995.

5. 3125 ABANDONED VEHICLE ABATEMENT:

The Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) program is charged with identification and removal of abandoned vehicles and parts of vehicles. The program is fully funded by the County Abandoned Vehicle Authority established under TCAG. Staffing and workload characteristics for the program are shown on the following tables:

AVA Staff

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Inspectors | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Support Staff | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| TOTAL | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.0 |

Caseload Statistics

| <u>Caseload</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Inspections | 1793 | 1883 | 1977 |
| Abatements | 101 | 120 | 130 |
| TOTAL | 1894 | 2003 | 2107 |

6. 3140 TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS:

The Countywide Planning Division provides staff support to TCAG which plays an important role in the development and implementation of the County's land use policy. Through TCAG, the County and the eight incorporated cities work together to achieve compatibility and consensus among the variety of competing interests to meet regional growth management needs. Staffing characteristics for the TCAG program are reflected in the following table:

TCAG Staffing

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| CD Specialists | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Technicians | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Support Staff | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| TOTAL | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.6 |

TCAG's two primary work elements have been, and will continue to be, the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan for the valley/lower foothill region of the County and preparation of Urban Boundary update studies for the incorporated cities. Other work elements include development of a model Safety Element, census coordination/ data requests, abandoned vehicle abatement coordination, TPA coordination, and clearinghouse reviews.

7. 3150 REDEVELOPMENT:

The Redevelopment and Grants Division provides staff services for the Tulare County Redevelopment Agency. The Agency conducts a wide variety of activities within the five project areas currently adopted. These activities are established in the Project Area Plans and are programmed under the five year Implementation Plans for each area recently adopted by the Board. Program elements consist of a wide variety of capital improvement projects, economic development activities (such as industrial park development) and housing programs. Staffing characteristics are described in the following table:

TCRA Staffing

| <u>Staffing</u> | <u>93-94</u> | <u>94-95</u> | <u>Proposed 95-96</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Planners | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| CD Specialists | 5.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Support Staff | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| TOTAL | 9.8 | 9.8 | 12.3 |

Although the TCRA work program for FY 95/96 has not been completed, it is anticipated that major work elements for next year will consist of the Goshen sewer collection system, stormwater drainage projects in Richgrove and Traver, completion of the fire station in Earlimart and continuation of the housing rehabilitation program. In addition, while it cannot be directly funded by TCRA, development of at least four additional project areas is also recommended for next year.

8. GRANTS:

The Redevelopment and Grants Division also provides staff support and administration for the County's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership (HOME) programs. A summary of the ongoing grant programs currently approved and administered by this division are as follows:

- 3125 CDBG Housing Rehabilitation Program utilizing Program Income from CDBG Rehab loan payments
- 4262 CDBG-516 The 1991 General Allocation Grant (\$500,000 closed out in FY 93-94) for Housing Rehabilitation in Delft Colony and Cutler; water connections in Delft Colony and Griggs Avenue; sewer connections in Yettem and Seville

- 4264 CDBG-575 The 1992 General Allocation Grant (\$500,000) for Housing Rehabilitation in Terra Bella, Poplar and Cotton-Center and sewer connections in Poplar and Midway. This grant will be closed out in 94-95.
- 4265 CDBG-681 The 1993 General Allocation Grant (\$500,000) for sewer connections in Tonyville; water connections in Yettem; HOMR program administration; housing rehabilitation in Cotton Center, Poplar and Terra Bella.
- 4267 CDBG-819 The 1994 General Allocation Grant (\$500,000) for construction of a County fire station in Doyle Colony, East Porterville.
- 495 HOME (Trust Fund) A \$1 million 1993 Grant for partial financing of a 35-unit low-income apartment project in Richgrove and a Countywide rehab program
- 94 STBG-841 A 1994 \$30,000 planning assistance grant to perform housing condition and income/interest surveys, prepare the 1995 CDBG and HOME applications, and conduct land use/zoning studies for Yettem, Seville, Tonyville and Poplar
- 94 EDBG-306 A 1994 \$30,000 Economic Development Planning Grant which is being used by the Tulare County EDC to perform a target industry study for the County.

Grants Staffing

| | 93-94 | 94-95 | Proposed 95-96 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| CD Specialists | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Support Staff | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| TOTAL | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 |

Assuming continued availability of Federal funding, grant applications for \$500,000 in CDBG General Allocation and \$1 million in HOME funds will also be prepared. The CDBG application will be for a continuation of the rehab program while HOME funds will be targeted to the Housing Authority's proposed apartment project in Poplar. It's also anticipated another round of economic development and planning assistance grants will be submitted although the topics for those grants are still in discussion.

D. GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) IMPLEMENTATION:

The GIS pilot program began 4 months ago, and since that time essential equipment, software, data and personnel have been put in place. The program is headed up by the GIS Coordinator and is additionally staffed by a Drafter III. (The program anticipates a reclassification of the Drafter III position to a GIS Technical Assistant. The program is currently awaiting the delivery of some additional equipment including an E-size plotter, PC/UNIX connectivity software, Teale data set and other miscellaneous supplies.

A parcel level base map of the 24 square mile pilot area has already been completed in Auto/CAD. This base map includes the following map layers: coordinate grid, section lines, parcels, street centerlines, railroad centerlines, old subdivision lot lines, State R-O-W (Highways 99 and 63), street R-O-W, railroad R-O-W and waterways. The next step will be to transfer the AutoCAD maps into ArchInfo applications. Additional map layers necessary for projects such as special districts, precincts, etc. will also be built. Work has already begun for the first application project--In Home Senior Services client tracking. This application is representative of many future tasks that will be needed to locate people or events geographically by address.

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
ANNUAL REPORT - 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

SECTION II.

| | |
|--|----|
| BACKGROUND - About the County: Demographics and Economics. . . . | 13 |
| ADVANCED PLANNING ACTIVITIES | 14 |
| LAND USE AND CIRCULATION ELEMENTS | 15 |
| CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENTS | 16 |
| NOISE ELEMENT. | 16 |
| SAFETY ELEMENT | 16 |
| HOUSING ELEMENT. | 17 |
| URBAN BOUNDARIES ELEMENT | 20 |
| SCENIC HIGHWAYS ELEMENT. | 21 |
| WATER AND LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT ELEMENT. | 21 |
| RECREATION ELEMENT | 22 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Fair Share Housing Allocation by Income Level. | 17 |
| Table 2: Progress in Meeting New Housing Need - 1994. | 18 |
| Table 3: Estimated Progress Toward Meeting New Housing. Need by Income Group - 1994 | 19 |

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

- ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1994 -

SECTION II.

This portion of the report is submitted in fulfillment of California Government Code Section 65400, which requires each county planning agency to report annually to its Board of Supervisors and to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on the status of the County's general plan and the progress in its implementation. Section 65400 also requires the annual report to include a discussion on the progress in meeting the County's share of regional housing needs, as determined pursuant to Government Code Section 65584, and a discussion of local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) of Section 65583, also as required by Section 65400.

BACKGROUND - About the County: Demographics and Economics

There are eight incorporated cities and about 50 small rural service centers scattered throughout the Valley portion of the County which are generally located at 5-10 mile intervals along the major road/highway system. The January 1, 1994, population estimate for the county was 350,616. Of this total, 59% of the population is located within the eight incorporated cities (up a tick from 58% in 1993). The City of Visalia contains the majority of this 58%, with a population of about 89,390. The growth rate of the unincorporated area for 1993 was estimated at 2.45% (up from 1.74% in 1993) while the growth rates of the eight cities averaged 2.8% (down slightly from the 1993 average of 3.0% with the highest rate being for the City of Porterville at 3.8%.

These statistics indicate that the existing urban areas of the County are experiencing relatively rapid growth and development, while the rural farm population is declining in proportion to the Countywide total.

Irrespective of the growth of the County's communities, agriculture remains the number one industry in the County. Even with the lingering effects of the drought, the 1994 Tulare County Agricultural Crop and Livestock Report for the County shows a total valuation of agricultural commodities produced in Tulare County at nearly \$2.4 billion dollars (up from \$2.2 billion dollars in 1993.) However, a fact which continually challenges the merits of the County's planning efforts, is that nearly every one of the Valley communities is located on prime agricultural land. Thus, it is not surprising that the County's Land Use Planning Program is heavily weighted toward protection and enhancement of the agricultural economic base.

ADVANCED PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Countywide Planning Division:

- 1 Planner IV
- 2 Planner III
- 3 Planner I/II
- 1 Community Develop. Specialist I/II
- 1 Planning Technician (frozen)

The majority of 'advanced planning' activities occur within the Countywide Planning Division. Advanced planning activities generally involve the preparation and maintenance of the County's general plan. (Some advanced planning work is carried out in the Environmental Assessment Division as a result of workload carryover from the former Foothill and Mountain Planning Division staff.

The Countywide Planning Division also provides staff support to the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The activities of LAFCO and TCAG, together with Tulare County Redevelopment Agency, play an important role in the development and implementation of County land use and housing policies and therefore are an integral part of the department's planning activities. Through LAFCO, policies related to such issues as the continuing loss of agricultural land to urbanization, and costs of and funding to assure adequate urban services are gaining increased public exposure. Through TCAG, the County and the eight incorporated cities work together to achieve compatibility and consensus among the variety of competing interests of each agency to meet their respective growth management needs. The ALUC has authority pursuant to the California Public Utility code to adopt land use measures that benefit the public by limiting exposure to aircraft hazards and excessive noise, and to ensure orderly expansion of public airports. The County has an adopted Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan in compliance with the said Public Utility code regulations.

The County's General Plan is comprised of several elements. The seven State-mandated elements of the General Plan are:

- 1) Land Use
- 2) Circulation
- 3) Conservation*
- 4) Open Space*
- 5) Noise
- 6) Safety (including Seismic Safety)
- 7) Housing

Other non-mandatory elements which the County has developed by its own option include:

- Urban Boundaries
- Scenic Highways
- Water and Liquid Waste Management
- Recreation*

Appendix A is a chart showing all the component documents of the County's General Plan and the date of the last revision (amendment) to that document.

* Note: The Conservation, Open Space and Recreation Elements are combined into a single document entitled Environmental Resources Management Element (ERME).

Land Use and Circulation Elements:

Because of the geographical diversity of the County, the Land Use and Circulation Element is comprised of several sub-regional components, in the form of individual area and community plans. The Valley floor, for instance, contains separate community plans for all eight cities, along with many of the unincorporated communities. The Rural Valley Lands Plan (RVLP), adopted in 1976, encompasses the remaining agricultural lands on the valley floor and generally directs the preservation of the important farm lands through the application of large lot exclusive agricultural zoning. To date, the Department has prepared community plans for the following unincorporated communities: Goshen, Three Rivers, Springville, Richgrove, Cutler-Orosi, Earlimart, Ivanhoe, Strathmore, and Traver, and is in progress in preparing community plans for Pixley and Poplar-Cotton Center.

On March 15, 1994, at the Joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors meeting, the Board was presented with the Final Report from the 1991-93 Agricultural Advisory Committee, and among other projects involving zoning issues, initiated an amendment to the County's Rural Valley Lands Plan to strengthen the Parcel Evaluation Criteria which is used to determine whether lands qualify for conversion to non-agricultural uses or zones. The amendments and companion changes to the zoning ordinance are scheduled for adoption in 1995.

Development in the foothill region is guided by three adopted land use and circulation plans. The two largest foothill communities--Three Rivers and Springville--each have their own community plan (adopted in 1981 and 1985 respectively) which address their individual land use and circulation needs. Currently a self-appointed group of Three Rivers residents is formulating a proposal for a comprehensive amendment to the Three Rivers Community Plan. The Committee has been working on and off with staff assistance for the last 3-4 years and could be ready to come before the Board of Supervisors with a presentation in 1995 or 1996.

The balance of the foothill region falls under the direction of the Foothill Growth Management Plan (FGMP), adopted in 1981. The FGMP was conceived as a companion document to the RVLP and Urban Boundaries Element to further the County's agricultural protection policies, by rationally directing urban/suburban growth into specific areas of the foothills--designated "Development Corridors". These "corridors" define areas where development can be serviced by state and local agencies in a manner that is cost efficient, safe and consistent with environmental constraints. The FGMP also maintains the agricultural viability of the foothills by identifying areas to be encouraged for intensive and extensive agricultural uses. The FGMP demonstrated success in achieving its original purposes in that the Development Corridors have accommodated development demands without needing to be significantly expanded or altered.

The mountain region of the County is geographically, socially, and economically distinct from the Valley and Foothill regions. Due to its remoteness, its environmental uniqueness, and availability of limited amounts of private lands, the area serves primarily a second-home, tourist-oriented recreation area with a small permanent population. The Mountain Plan, as originally conceived, is to consist of seven sub-area plans, each dealing with a specific autonomous area of the mountain region (generally those private inholdings lying within the National Forest, National Park, and Bureau of Land Management territories of Tulare County. Two of the sub-area plans have been completed--the Kennedy Meadows Plan, adopted in 1986 and the Great Western Divide (North Half) Plan, adopted in 1990.

The process of continuing sub-area plans was suspended last year when the Board directed that the Department begin work on a "Framework Plan" that would provide broad land use development policies to be applied comprehensively and uniformly over all of the private inholdings in the mountain region. This directive came about from a recognition by the Board that the sub-area plan process has been extremely time consuming due to the desire to utilize citizen advisory committees and a compelling interest to establish uniform policies to guide development of mountain inholdings. The intent of the Framework Plan is not to take the place of the sub-area plans but rather to function as an 'umbrella' document. Upon completion of the Framework Plan, staff will resume preparation of the sub-area plans that will focus in more detail on the development and land use needs unique to each sub-area.

Conservation and Open Space Elements:

The County has combined these two required elements into one document--The Environmental Resources Management Element or "ERME". This element was adopted in 1972 and comprises base data, policies and programs to implement both the resource conservation, open space, and recreation needs of Tulare County. This document has succeeded due to its strength in being comprehensive and integrating the related concerns for aspects of the environment into one cohesive management policy. This document has undergone few amendments over the year, but will need to be amended, possibly in 1995 or 1996, to implement recommended changes by the County Resource Policy Advisory Committee in response to recent changes in the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA).

In addition, as elaborated upon in the 1991-93 Tulare County Agricultural Advisory Committee's Report and Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, ERME is also expected to be revised to incorporate an Animal Waste Management Component which will adopt "Poultry Facility Locational Policies" and "Dairy/Animal Confinement Facility Locational Policies". This project is currently on hold awaiting the University of California study of water quality impacts, but could be expected in 1995/96.

Noise Element:

This element was adopted in 1988. This element conforms to the the 1987 State Noise Element Guidelines. No amendments to this document are anticipated in the near future. Acoustical analyses are required for development projects pursuant to policies contained in this document allowing noise mitigation measures to be adopted as necessary with project approvals.

Safety Element:

Until 1984, the State mandated a Seismic Safety Element separate from the Safety Element. Today, however, the issues formerly included in the guidelines for seismic safety have been incorporated into the requirements of the overall Safety Element.

Based upon this change in the State General Plan Guidelines, the Safety Element of the County General Plan now requires revision. Initially adopted in 1975, and not amended since that time, sections of the Safety Element addressing such issues as evacuation routes, water supplies, fire hazards, and flooding may now be out-of-date, based upon changing conditions in the County, as to necessitate reevaluation and revision. Moreover, updating this element will reflect incorporation of both the previously separate Seismic Safety Element and the county's

Flood Control Master Plan into a consolidated Safety Element. Provisions of the Hazardous Waste Management Plan adopted by TCAG in 1989 will also be incorporated into the consolidated Safety Element. Though the updated Safety Element had been targeted for completion during the fiscal year 92/93, loss of staff and frozen positions in the Countywide Planning division have hampered progress on the Plan. Progress on the Safety Element has been scheduled to resume during the Department's 96/97 Work Program, depending on TCAG funding.

Housing Element :

One of the more significant general plan elements for the County is the Housing Element, last revised in March, 1993 (GPA 93-01.) Tulare County's next update to its Housing Element will be due in June of 1999.

A significant responsibility of the County in implementing the General Plan is achieving the goals and policies of the adopted Housing Element. The State Legislature has declared that the availability of housing is a matter of "vital statewide importance" and "the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order." The County's Housing Element consists of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing. The housing element assesses the housing needs of the variety of economic segments of the county and includes implementation measures formulated to meet those needs.

As required by Government Code Section 65584 the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) determined the county's fair share of the regional housing need to be 5,405 housing units (single family and apartments) during the period 1990-1997 allocated as follows:

TABLE 1

FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION BY INCOME LEVEL Tulare County Unincorporated Area - 1990-1997

| Family Income Category | Maximum Monthly Cost ¹ | Housing Need (units) |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Very Low | $(.50 \times \text{area median income}^2 \times .30 / 12 = \$293.)$ | 1,400 (26%) |
| Low | $(.60 \times \text{area median income} \times .30 / 12 = \$352.)$ | 1,242 (22.9%) |
| Moderate | $(1.00 \times \text{area median income} \times .30 / 12 = \$587.)$ | 1,067 (19.7%) |
| Above Moderate | | 1,696 (31.4%) |
| Total | | 5,405 |

¹ The State does not prescribe maximum sales prices for for-sale units, as such, maximum monthly costs are used.

² Area median income from 1990 Census = \$23,489.00

The total County need of 5,405 units represents approximately 27% of the total countywide (including the 8 cities) housing unit need determined to be 20,365 over the planning period 1990-1997.

The following table shows the County's progress in meeting the established housing need within the Tulare County unincorporated area by housing types up to the end of 1994.

TABLE 2
PROGRESS IN MEETING NEW HOUSING NEED: 1990-1997
Tulare County Unincorporated Area

| Year | Single-Family ¹ | Multiple-Family ¹ | Mobile-homes ¹ | Other ¹ | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Need for New Units 1990-1997 | 4,254 | 346 | 740 | 65 | 5,405 |
| New Units Constructed 1990-1994 | 1,174 | 279 | 770 | N/A | 2,223 |
| Number of New Units Added in 1994 | 235 | 87 | 290 | | 612 |
| Remaining Need 1995-1997 | 3,080 | 67 | (30) | 65 | 3,182 |

¹ Based on the percentage of dwelling units by type from the 1990 U.S. Census and includes units demolished in 1990 and 1991, and 1992 (as taken from the 1992 Tulare County Housing Element) and type of unit and units demolished (as taken from the 1994 State Dept. of Finance estimates.)

Essentially what the chart indicates is at 4 years or 57% into the planning period the County is falling somewhat behind in meeting its housing need on a purely annual basis. With 3/7 or 43% of the planning period remaining (95-97), roughly 59% of our housing need until 1997 is, as yet, unmet. Reasons for this lag includes an inability of the market to respond to farmworker housing needs, a rise in cost of building materials over the last 2 1/2 years (e.g. effects from spotted owl issue reducing timber yields), a catch-up effect in recovering from the winter freeze of 1991, the effect of company closings and resulting job losses, and reduction in real estate speculation as a reaction to the overall state of the State economy.

The next table shows the estimated progress in meeting the County's housing need by income group.

TABLE 3

ESTIMATED PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING NEW HOUSING NEED BY INCOME GROUP: 1990-1994
Tulare County Unincorporated Area

| Year | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Above Moderate | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Need for New Units 1990-1997 | 1,400 | 1,242 | 1,067 | 1,696 | 5,405 |
| New Units Constructed 1990-1994 | 380 ¹ | 333 ¹ | 618 ² | 892 ² | 2,223 |
| Units Added in 1994 | 105 ³ | 92 ³ | 170 ³ | 245 ³ | 612 ³ |
| Remaining Need 1995-1997 | 1,020 | 909 | 449 | 804 | 3,182 |

1 Based on the percentage increase in the number of units which were estimated to be affordable between 1990 and 1997 considering 1980 U.S. Census Income data (reference Table IV-3 of 1992 Tulare County Housing Element). Includes units added in 1993 and 1994.

2 Based on the percentage of units needed between 1990 and 1997, including units added in 1994.

3 Units added in 1994 as reported to the State Department of Finance.

What this table indicates is that with approximately 43% of the planning period remaining, 73% of the 'very low' housing need is yet to be met; 73% of the 'low' housing need; 42% of the 'moderate' housing need; and 47% of the 'above moderate' housing need. This demonstrates that while the County is at its target for moderate income level housing, it is lagging in meeting very low, low, and above moderate income level housing needs.

As noted in the opening paragraph of this report, one of the requirements of the annual report to the Board of Supervisors is to include discussion of local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of affordable housing. Because this is a fairly complex topic, APPENDIX C includes the full text of that portion of the 1993 Housing Element which contains numerous policies specifically aimed at minimizing or removing constraints to the production of an adequate amount of housing at affordable prices for all income groups. One specific example of note where a constraint to affordable housing was removed involves the approval in 1994 of 107 lot residential subdivision in the community of Poplar. In this approval, the Board of Supervisors removed a Planning Commission recommended requirement to construct a new road connecting the subdivision to State Route 190 as an alternate access to the development. Without this requirement, all access would be directed through an adjacent residential neighborhood. Instead, the Board directed that road construction not be required unless funding through grants or other sources was made available to the project. Since the project was to be for low-income housing, removing the road improvement requirement will help keep the lots at an affordable level.

More generally the County has had other successes in removing governmental constraints to affordable housing by the use of residential zoning with provisions for mobilehomes and manufactured dwellings, reduction in building permit fees for

low to moderate income development that meets certain criteria, a track record of approvals of most residential subdivisions in the rural communities without extraordinary improvement requirements, frequent use of "tiering" environmental documents for development projects to EIRs already prepared for the respective community plan, thereby reducing the up-front cost to the developer, aggressive track record in pursuing and obtaining grants for public facilities and housing rehabilitation, and use of citizen advisory committees to advise and recommend on needed ordinance changes. Currently in progress is a proposed ordinance for density bonus provisions.

Urban Boundaries Element:

The Urban Boundaries Element is an non-mandated element of the County's General Plan, first adopted in 1974 and amended numerous times since. The purpose of the Urban Boundaries Element has been, among other things, to:

- 1.) Establish twenty-year planning areas, the outside limit of which is called the *Urban Development Boundary* (UDB) around incorporated cities in which the County and cities will coordinate plans, policies and standards relating to land divisions, building construction, land use and zoning regulations, environmental impact reports and other closely related matters affecting the orderly development of urban fringe areas, recognizing that these boundaries provide an official definition of the interface between future urban and agricultural uses; and,
- 2.) Establish *Urban Area Boundaries* (UAB)--areas within which land uses are presumed to have an impact upon the adjacent incorporated city or community, and within which the cities' concerns are to be given serious consideration as part of the land use review process, recognizing that this area is the next logical place within which the UDB may be expanded and that preservation of productive agricultural land will be the highest priority when consideration of expanding the UDB is given.

Now that TCAG's funded planning positions are fully staffed, it will be possible to commence work once again on the Urban Boundary studies that were initiated in the 1980's. Under that program, the County of Tulare committed to a program to establish 20 year planning areas (Urban Development Boundaries-UDB's) around each incorporated city and unincorporated community in the County. The intent of these boundaries is to identify areas within which the County and cities will coordinate plans, policies and standards related to building construction, subdivision development, land use and zoning regulations, street and highway construction, public utility systems, environmental studies and other closely related matters affecting the orderly development of urban fringe areas. From a strategic growth perspective, it is recognized that these boundaries provide an official definition of the interface between future urban and agricultural land uses.

The program to identify the UDBs was a major work element in the late 1980's. Urban Development Boundaries were adopted for the cities of Visalia, Lindsay, Farmersville and Woodlake, and for the unincorporated communities of Ivanhoe, Strathmore, Traver, Earlimart, Goshen, Cutler-Orosi, and Richgrove. However, the program was stalled from 1981 to 1991 as a result of extensive work involved with the City of Porterville community plan revision. Following completion of that project, staff turnovers and budget cutbacks forced a re-prioritization of the Urban Boundaries project. However, now that all the TCAG planning positions have been filled and, assuming adoption of LAFCo's intended Spheres of Influence

policies, it is anticipated that Urban Boundaries Development will once again become a major focus for the next two or three years. Funding for development of these Urban Development Boundaries have been a part of the Tulare County Association of Governments' budget for the last several years. In this respect, TCAG too recognizes the importance of Urban Development Boundaries and the need to assure funding adequate to develop the boundaries and keep them up to date.

In 1995 the Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the Urban Boundaries of the Cities of Visalia and Tulare. The Department will follow up on these amendments with updates to the County Land Use Plans and respective rezonings for these cities. As soon as these projects are completed (1995) work will begin on the City of Dinuba Area Urban Boundary and land use studies. The department is also in the process of developing a response to the City of Porterville's request to amend the UDB to take into consideration areas of City-proposed expansion.

The importance of Urban Development Boundaries comes from the policy that no development may take place around an incorporated city within its UDB unless it is first considered for annexation by the affected city. The policy thus constitutes an important feature of the County's planning process in that it assures that cities are given a strong role in the planning and development of unincorporated lands within its urban fringe. The policy states that the County will not entertain development in those areas unless the adjacent city does not consent to annex or annexation is not possible under provisions of law.

However, these policies are only effective for cities once the city and County have reached agreement on the city's Urban Development Boundary. LAFCO is expected to consider a policy change which would set city spheres of influence at the same Urban Development Boundary. If this policy is adopted as recommended, annexations would be barred outside the Urban Development Boundary.

Scenic Highways Element

The County's Scenic Highways Element was first adopted in June of 1975 and has undergone very few, if any, amendments. The element contains two highways designated as eligible State Scenic Highways in the State Master Plan. These are as follows: 1) Highway 198 east of Freeway 99 to Sequoia National Park. and 2) Highway 190 east of Porterville to Springville.

Scenic corridors must be included as important components of a system of open space. The County endorses both the economic and intrinsic merits of the Scenic Highway program as essential to the success of the Tulare County General Plan.

Obviously the scope of the element covers only the unincorporated areas of the County. Since general law cities are also required to adopt the Scenic Highway Elements, when a city proposes a scenic route, or where an eligible State Scenic Highway passes through an incorporated area, the city must take the responsibility for enacting and enforcing its own scenic highways program. It is this County's intention, however, to coordinate with cities where scenic routes cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Water and Liquid Waste Management

This Plan was adopted as part of the Tulare County General Plan in 1971. The Plan contains a comprehensive analysis of community sewer and water systems and needs countywide, and sets forth recommendations for improvements to those systems. However, much of this information is now out of date, and at this time no

proposal is being considered to update the subject element. For the most part the activities of the Redevelopment and Grants Planning Division have supplanted the need for this plan.

Recreation

See discussion under Conservation and Open Space.

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Year | | File | Price | Element/Amendment | PC Resolution | | BOS Resolution | | Superseded or Amended By: |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|--|-------------------|----------|----------------|----------|--|
| GPA | | # | | | # | Date | # | Date | |
| Airport | | | | | | | | | |
| 1971 | 209.2 | | N/A | Airport Master Plan | None | 12/23/70 | 71-3131 | 4/27/71 | Aviation Element and Airport System Plan |
| 84-04 | 209.4 | | \$14.00 | Aviation Element and Airport System Plan | 6117 | 2/27/85 | 85-491 | 4/2/85 | |
| Cutler-Orosi | | | | | | | | | |
| 80-05 | 208.1A | | N/A | Cutler-Orosi Urban Improvement Boundary | 5548 | 9/24/80 | 80-2613 | 10/21/80 | Cutler-Orosi Community Plan |
| 87-10 | 250.7 | | \$14.50 | Cutler-Orosi Community Plan | 6535 | 7/27/88 | 88-1051 | 8/30/88 | Portion by GPA 89-03 |
| 88-04 | 250.71 | | N/A | Cutler-Orosi Plan Amendment-Kings River Bank | Denied | 5/10/89 | | | |
| 89-03 | 250.72 | | \$0.30 | Cutler-Orosi LU and UB Amendment | 6789 | 8/22/90 | 90-1346 | 11/6/90 | |
| 92-10 | 201.8H | | | Cutler-Orosi Specific Plan Area Delete and L.U. | Void | | | | |
| 94-04 | 201.71 | | | Cutler-Orosi Land Use, Pena's Disposal | Pending - Beverly | | | | |
| 94-05 | 201.71 | | | Cutler-Orosi Land Use, Jesus Martinez | 7396 | 6/14/95 | | oct95 | |
| 95-01 | 201.81 | | | Cutler-Orosi Specific Plan Area Delete and L.U. | 7401 | 6/14/95 | | oct95 | |
| Earlmar | | | | | | | | | |
| 87-11 | 250.8 | | \$9.00 | Earlmar Community Plan | 6565 | 9/28/88 | 88-1438 | 11/29/88 | Portion by GPAs 81-06, 89-04, 89-06 |
| 89-04 | 250.81 | | \$0.30 | Earlmar Community Plan LU Amendment | 6808 | 9/26/90 | 90-1346 | 11/6/90 | |
| 89-06 | 250.82 | | N/A | Earlmar Community Plan Amendment-Howard | 7278 | 2/27/94 | 94-1173 | 9/27/94 | |
| Environmental Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| 1972 | 203.1 | | \$13.60 | Environmental Resources Mgmt. Element | 3676 | 6/21/72 | 72-2173 | 6/27/72 | |
| 1972 | | | N/A | Conservation | 3676 | 6/21/72 | 72-2173 | 6/27/72 | |
| 1972 | | | N/A | Open Space | 3676 | 6/21/72 | 72-2173 | 6/27/72 | Portion by GPA 87-06 |
| 74-2F | 203.32 | | Inc. w/2A | Redesignation of Alpaugh to Viable | 4242 | 8/28/74 | 74-2923 | 10/24/74 | Portion by GPA 83-04A |
| Flood Control | | | | | | | | | |
| 1972 | 210.2 | | \$12.50 | Flood Control Master Plan | 3613 | 11/10/71 | 72-38 | 1/11/72 | |
| Foothill Growth Management Plan Area | | | | | | | | | |
| 74-6 | | | N/A | Springville Open Space | 4641 | 6/23/76 | 76-2043 | 7/27/76 | Springville Community Plan |
| 1980 | 201.1D | | \$6.75 | Foothill Growth Management Plan | 5547 | 9/17/80 | 80-2731 | 11/4/80 | Portion by GPAs 83-03, 86-12, 87-06 |
| | | | | | 5563 | 10/30/80 | 81-385 | 2/24/81 | |
| | | | | | 5603 | 1/14/81 | | | |
| 83-03 | 201.6D | | \$0.50 | FGMP-Badger Area | 5906 | 4/13/83 | 83-658 | 5/17/83 | |
| 84-03 | 250.4 | | \$12.40 | Springville Community Plan | 5087 | 10/24/84 | 85-77 | 1/15/85 | Portion by GPA 90-03 |
| 84-05 | 201.9D | | N/A | Foothill Plan-Milo Area | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 86-12 | 201.4F | | \$0.20 | Tule River Development Corridor | 6481 | 3/9/88 | 88-643 | 5/24/88 | |
| 90-03 | 250.41 | | N/A | Springville Community Plan Amendment | 7117 | 2/24/92 | 93-0825 | 7/27/93 | |
| Goshen | | | | | | | | | |
| 78-3A | 250.1 | | \$4.00 | Goshen Community Plan | 5116 | 8/9/78 | 78-2380 | 9/5/78 | Portion by GPA 87-07 |
| 87-07 | 250.11 | | \$0.50 | Goshen Community Plan, Visalia Land Use Plan, Urban Boundaries Element | 6404 | 7/22/87 | 87-1046 | 8/11/87 | Portion by GPA 92-07A |
| Housing | | | | | | | | | |
| 1971 | 202.1 | | N/A | Housing Element | 3781 | 1/10/73 | 73-686 | 2/13/73 | 1975 Housing Element |
| 1973 | 202.2 | | N/A | Housing Element | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 1975 | 202.3 | | N/A | Housing Element | 4567 | 3/10/76 | 76-876 | 3/23/76 | 1980 Housing Element |
| 1980 | 202.4 | | N/A | Housing Element | 5440 | 3/26/80 | 81-1346 | 7/7/81 | 1984 Housing Element |
| 84-01 | 202.5 | | N/A | Housing Element | 5052 | 6/27/84 | 84-1215 | 7/31/84 | Portion by GPA 90-05, GPA 92-02 |

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Element/Amendment | | | | PC Resolution | | BOS Resolution | | Superseded or Amended By: |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------|--|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|
| Year GPA | File # | Price | | # | Date | # | Date | |
| 90-05 | 202.6 | N/A | Housing Element-2 Year Time Extension | 6810 | 10/10/90 | 90-1345 | 11/6/90 | Portion by GPA 93-01 |
| 92-02 | 202.7 | \$11.00 | Housing Element | 7110 | 2/10/93 | 93-0271 | 3/23/93 | |
| 93-01 | 202.7 | \$0.20 | Housing Element (1992) Modification | 7110 | 2/10/93 | 93-0271 | 3/23/93 | |
| Ivanhoe | | | | | | | | |
| 87-12 | 250.9 | N/A | Ivanhoe Community Plan | 6800 | 9/12/90 | 90-1180 | 10/2/90 | Portion by GPA 92-01 |
| 92-01 | 250.91 | \$0.25 | Ivanhoe Community Plan Land Use Amendment | 7069 | 9/23/92 | 93-0825 | 7/27/93 | |
| Kings River | | | | | | | | |
| 82-01 | 250.5 | \$7.75 | Kings River Plan | 5864 | 11/10/82 | 82-2030 | 12/14/82 | Portion by GPAs 74-1A/B/C/D/2A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H, 75-1E/F/H, 76-7B/C, 77-1A/B/2, 78-3B/C, 80-02/07, 81-02/03/04/08, 82-04, 85-04A, 86-07. Also by community and area plans for specific areas. |
| 87-03 | 201.7F | N/A | Kings River General Plan Amendment-Tinch | | Withdrawn | | Withdrawn | |
| Land Use and Circulation | | | | | | | | |
| 1964 | 201.1 | \$8.00 | Land Use and Circulation Element | 2458 | 3/25/64 | 64-198 | 5/26/64 | City land use plans for all but Dinuba |
| 1966 | 201.3 | \$0.30 | Tulare County Area General Plan Amendment | 2866 | 7/13/66 | 66-1482 | 8/2/66 | |
| 1966 | 201.4 | N/A | Visalia Airport Land Use Amendment | 2898 | 10/26/66 | 66-2153 | 11/22/66 | GPA 77-2 |
| 1966 | | N/A | Tulare Area Land Use Element Amendment | 2861 | 6/22/66 | 66-1394 | 7/19/66 | GPA 80-02 |
| 74-1A | 201.6 | \$0.30 | Northeast Visalia Area Land Use and Circulation | 4043 | 1/9/74 | 74-1126 | 4/9/74 | GPA 81-04 |
| 74-1B | 201.7 | \$0.20 | Statement of Policy | 4060 | 2/13/74 | 74-1126 | 4/9/74 | |
| 74-1C | 201.8 | N/A | Lindsay Land Use Amendment | 4077 | 3/6/74 | 74-1126 | 4/9/74 | Incorporated into GPA 77-2 |
| 74-2A | 201.1A | \$2.40 | Northeast Visalia Land Use | 4229 | 8/14/74 | 74-3152 | 11/12/74 | |
| 75-1A | 201.3A | N/A | Visalia Area Highway 198 Land Use | 4390 | 5/14/75 | 75-1798 | 7/1/75 | GPA 78-2 |
| 75-1B | 216.21 | N/A | Civic Center Master Plan | 4380 | 4/23/75 | 75-1321 | 5/20/75 | |
| 75-1H | 201.6A | N/A | West Porterville Land Use | 4507 | 11/26/75 | 75-3679 | 12/23/75 | GPA 87-06 |
| 76-4 | 201.8A | N/A | Springville Land Use | 4641 | 6/23/76 | 76-2043 | 7/27/76 | GPA 84-03 |
| 76-7B | 201.9A | \$0.30 | Farmersville Land Use | 4765 | 12/27/76 | 76-3644 | 12/28/76 | Urban Boundaries portion by GPA 85-05 |
| 76-7C | 201.1B | \$0.70 | Exeter Land Use | 4734 | 12/27/76 | 76-3644 | 12/28/76 | |
| 1977 | 201.7B | N/A | Visalia Rural Residential Study | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 78-2 | 216.22 | \$0.25 | Civic Center Master Plan Amendment | 5000 | 2/22/78 | 78-715 | 3/21/78 | |
| 78-3B | 201.5B | \$0.25 | Woodlake Land Use | 5109 | 8/9/78 | 78-2380 | 9/5/78 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 78-3C | 201.6B | \$0.20 | Visalia Area, Road 86, SR 198 | 5112 | 8/9/78 | 78-2380 | 9/5/78 | |
| 80-04 | 201.9B | \$0.25 | Woodlake Land Use | 5428 | 3/26/80 | 80-1255 | 5/20/80 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 80-07 | 201.2C | \$0.40 | East Tulare Land Use | Not Adopted | | 80-3110 | 12/30/80 | |
| 80-08 | 216.7 | N/A | Public Schools Amendment | Unknown-Initiated by PC | | | | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 81-02 | 201.4C | \$0.30 | Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings | 5678 | 6/24/81 | 81-1873 | 9/29/81 | |
| 81-04 | 201.6C | \$0.70 | Lindsay Land Use | 5740 | 10/28/81 | 81-2346 | 11/24/81 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 81-05 | 201.7C | N/A | Visalia Land Use-Wong | Unknown-no file found | | | | |
| 81-08 | 201.9C | \$0.60 | Sierra View Golf Course | 5847 | 9/8/82 | 82-1744 | 10/19/82 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 83-02 | 204.5D | N/A | Tulare Circulation | Unknown-no file found | | | | |
| 83-06 | | \$0.25 | Visalia Land Use | Not Adopted | | 84-97 | 1/17/84 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 84-02 | 201.8D | \$0.25 | Southwest Visalia Area Land Use Plan | Not Adopted | | 84-1518 | 9/25/84 | |
| 85-04A | 201.2E | \$1.00 | Land Use Amendment for Alta, Pruner, Eckert, & Harmon Fields | 6212 | 1/8/86 | 86-475 | 4/15/86 | Portion by GPA 86-07 |
| 86-01 | 201.4E | N/A | Visalia K Road | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Year | File # | Price | Element/Amendment | PC Resolution # | Date | BOS Resolution # | Date | Superseded or Amended By: |
|---|---------|---------|---|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------|--|
| GPA | | | | | | | | |
| 86-04 | 201.6E | N/A | Circulation Element Update | Not Adopted | 1/14/87 | Not Adopted | | |
| 86-07 | 201.8E | \$0.25 | Woodlake Land Use | 6324 6339 | 3/11/87 | 87-484 | 4/14/87 | |
| Land Use and Circulation Continued | | | | | | | | |
| 86-08 | 201.9E | | West Exeter Specific Plan | See Marge for #'s | | | 9/5/89 | |
| 87-02 | 201.6F | \$0.25 | Visalia Land Use Plan | 6344 | 4/8/87 | 87-764 | 6/30/87 | |
| 87-05 | 201.8F | N/A | Visalia Land Use Amendment-Morris | Withdrawn | | Withdrawn | | |
| 87-08 | 201.1G | N/A | Dinuba GP Amendment-Klassen | Withdrawn | | Withdrawn | | |
| 88-03 | 201.6G | N/A | Oak Ranch | Denied | | Denied | | |
| 88-05 | 201.7G | N/A | Visalia GP Amendment-Crisp | Denied 6/28/89 | | | | |
| 89-02 | 201.8G | N/A | Stone Transfer Station-Lemon Cove | Pending-Wayne | | | | |
| 90-01 | 201.9G | \$0.25 | Visalia Land Use Plan, UB, Crisp-Sciaccia | Not Adopted | | 92-0838 | 7/21/92 | |
| 90-07 | 203.23 | | Mineral Resources Policy-Kaweah Rock | Pending-Mary B. | | | | |
| 91-01 | 201.3H | | Farmersville LU, Circ. and OS Amendment | Pending? | | | | |
| 91-04 | 203.23 | | Hannah Ranch Site | Pending-Mary B. | | | | |
| 92-05 | 203.81 | | Poultry Facility Locational Guidelines | Pending-Jennifer | | | | |
| 92-07B | 201.6H | | Visalia Land Use and Circulation | Pending-Andrew R. | | | | |
| 93-04 | 201.11 | | Land Use Amendment-Rural Residential | Pending-Mary B. | | | | |
| 94-07 | 201.91 | | Tulare Land Use and Circulation | Pending-Andrew R. | | | | |
| Library | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 | 216.3 | \$5.00 | Library Master Plan | 3794 | 2/14/73 | 73-1040 | 3/13/73 | |
| Mooney Boulevard Corridor | | | | | | | | |
| 77-2 | 201.4B | \$0.50 | Visalia Area Land Use | 4837 4887 | 4/27/77 7/13/77 | 77-2116 | 8/2/77 | Portion by GPAs 83-06, 84-02, 87-02, 87-07, 90-01 |
| 80-02 | 201.8B | \$0.95 | Tulare Land Use | 5415 | 3/12/80 | 80-630 | 3/18/80 | |
| Mountain Area | | | | | | | | |
| 86-02 | 201.5E | \$10.00 | Kennedy Meadows Plan | 5296 | 9/24/86 | 86-1376 | 10/28/86 | Portion by GPA's 92-03, 94-01 |
| 86-11 | 201.3F | \$3.75 | Great Western Divide North 1/2 Plan | 5820 | 10/10/90 | 90-1410 | 11/20/90 | Portion by GPA 94-04 |
| 92-03 | 201.5H | \$0.25 | Kennedy Meadows Plan Amendment | 7042 | 7/22/92 | 92-1012 | 9/15/92 | |
| 92-09 | 201.7H | | Great Western Divide Plan South Half | Pending-Josie | | | | |
| 93-05 | 201.2I | | Great Western Divide North 1/2 Amendment | 7192 | 12/1/93 | | 6/14/94 | |
| 94-01 | 201.5E1 | | Kennedy Meadows Land Use Plan Amendment | 7329 | 12/14/94 | 95-0482 | 4/18/95 | |
| Noise | | | | | | | | |
| 1975 | 207.1 | N/A | Noise Element | 4345 | 2/26/75 | 75-1675 | 6/17/75 | GPA 86-03 |
| 86-03 | 207.2 | \$12.00 | Noise Element | 6453 | 1/13/88 | 88-160 | 2/9/88 | |
| Pixley | | | | | | | | |
| 92-06 | 250.3A | | Pixley Community Plan | Pending-Dave B. | | | | |
| Poplar - Cotton Center | | | | | | | | |
| 94-02 | 250.4A | | Poplar-Cotton Center Community Plan | Void | | | | |
| Porterville | | | | | | | | |
| 1966 | 201.2 | N/A | Porterville Land Use Amendment | 2857 | 6/8/66 | 66-1435 | 7/26/66 | GPAs 74-1D, 74-2H, 75-1E, 75-H, 77-1A, 77-1B, 81-03, 82-04 |
| 74-1D | 201.9 | N/A | Northwest Porterville Land Use Amendment | 4082 4505 | 3/13/74 11/26/75 | 74-1126 | 4/9/74 | GPA 87-06 |

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Year GPA | File # | Price | Element/Amendment | PC Resolution | | BOS Resolution | | Superseded or Amended By: |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| | | | | # | Date | # | Date | |
| 74-2H | 201.2A | N/A | Northwest Porterville Reserve Line | 4270 | 10/9/74 | 74-3152 | 11/12/74 | GPA 87-06 |
| 75-1E | 201.5A | N/A | Central Porterville Land Use | 4489 4505 | 10/22/75 11/26/75 | 75-3444 | 12/2/75 | Portion by GPA 82-04, all by GPA 87-06 |
| 75-1F | 201.7A | N/A | North Porterville Land Use | 4546 | 2/11/76 | 76-1220 | 4/27/76 | GPA 87-06 |
| 77-1A | 201.2B | N/A | Porterville Land Use | 4851 | 5/25/77 | 77-2116 | 8/2/77 | GPA 87-06 |
| 77-1B | 201.3B | N/A | East Porterville Land Use | 4766 | 1/12/77 | 77-2116 | 8/2/77 | Portion by GPA 82-04, all by GPA 87-06 |
| Porterville Continued | | | | | | | | |
| 81-03 | 201.5C | N/A | Porterville LU, Circulation, and UAB | 5735 5751 | 10/14/81 12/16/81 | 82-535 | 3/30/82 | GPA 87-06 |
| 82-04 | 201.3D | \$0.75 | East Porterville Plan | 5961 | 8/10/83 | 83-1300 | 9/20/83 | Portion by GPA 88-02 |
| 85-03 | 201.1E | N/A | East Porterville Pettis Street | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 87-06 | 201.9F | \$10.00 | Porterville Community Plan | 6755 | 7/25/90 | 90-1202 | 10/9/90 | |
| 87-09 | 201.2G | N/A | Porterville GP Amendment-Schwin | Unknown-no file found | | | | |
| 88-02 | 201.5G | \$0.50 | East Porterville-Latham | 6603 | 1/25/89 | 89-0947 | 7/18/89 | |
| 90-04 | 201.1H | N/A | East Porterville Land Use Plan Amendment | 6907 | 6/12/91 | 91-1164 | 10/8/91 | |
| 90-08 | 201.2H | | Porterville Clean Up-Weisenberger | Pending-Jennifer | | | | |
| Recreation | | | | | | | | |
| 1972 | | | Recreation | 3676 | 6/21/72 | 72-2173 | 6/27/72 | Portion by GPAs 75-1C, 76-3 |
| 74-2B | 203.41 | N/A | Expansion of Recreation Projects List | 4225 | 8/14/74 | 74-2476 | 9/3/74 | |
| 74-2C | 203.31 | Inc. w/2A | Open Space Policy | 4241 | 8/28/74 | 74-3253 | 11/26/74 | |
| 74-2G | 203.42 | Inc. w/2A | Expansion of Recreation Projects List | 4237 | 8/28/74 | 74-2699 | 9/24/74 | |
| 75-1C | 203.43 | \$0.10 | Expansion of Recreation Projects List | 4455 | 8/13/75 | 75-2499 | 9/9/75 | |
| 76-3 | 203.44 | \$0.20 | Expansion of Recreation Projects List | 4610 | 5/12/76 | 76-1682 | 6/22/76 | |
| Richgrove | | | | | | | | |
| 87-04 | 250.6 | \$11.00 | Richgrove Community Plan | 5364 | 5/27/87 | 87-872 | 6/30/87 | |
| 89-05 | 250.62 | \$0.10 | Richgrove Community Plan LU Amendment | 6809 | 9/26/90 | 90-1346 | 11/6/90 | |
| Rural Valley Lands Plan | | | | | | | | |
| 75-1D | 201.4A | N/A | Rural Valley Lands Plan | 4488 | 10/22/75 | 75-3444 | 12/2/75 | Portion by GPA 85-04A, all by GPA 86-09 |
| 86-09 | 201.1F | \$0.75 | Rural Valley Lands Plan | 6316 6319 | 11/26/86 12/10/86 | 87-484 | 4/14/87 | Portion by GPA 94-08 |
| 94-08 | | | Rural Valley Lands Plan | 7386 | 5/10/95 | | 6/27/95 | |
| Safety | | | | | | | | |
| 1975 | 206.1 | \$3.50 | Safety Element | 4339 | 3/26/75 | 75-1676 | 6/17/75 | |
| Scenic Highways | | | | | | | | |
| 1975 | 205.1 | \$2.00 | Scenic Highways Element | 4461 | 8/27/75 | 75-2590 | 9/16/75 | |
| Seismic Safety | | | | | | | | |
| 1975 | 204.1 | \$12.00 | Seismic Safety Element | 4260 | 9/18/74 | 75-711 | 3/11/75 | |
| Strathmore | | | | | | | | |
| 87-13 | 250.1A | \$12.00 | Strathmore Community Plan | 6704 | 10/25/89 | 89-1552 | 11/28/89 | Portion by GPAs 90-06, 93-03 |
| 90-06 | 250.1A1 | \$0.40 | Strathmore Land Use Modification | 6903 | 5/22/91 | 91-1164 | 10/8/91 | |
| 93-03 | 201.9H | | Strathmore Community Plan Amendment | Not Adopted | | 94-0174 | 6/14/94 | |
| Three Rivers | | | | | | | | |
| 80-01 | 250.2 | \$6.00 | Three Rivers Community Plan | 5424 | 3/12/80 | 80-1255 | 5/20/80 | Portion by GPAs 81-01/07, 83-05/5A-85-05B, 87-01/14A/B, 90-02, 94-03 |

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Year GPA | File # | Price | Element/Amendment | PC Resolution | | BOS Resolution | | Superseded or Amended By: |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|--|
| | | | | # | Date | # | Date | |
| 80-06 | 201.1C | N/A | Three Rivers Land Use | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 81-01 | 201.3C | \$0.10 | Three Rivers Land Use | 5661 | 6/3/81 | 81-1873 | 9/29/81 | |
| 81-07 | 201.8C | \$0.70 | Three Rivers Land Use | 5824 | 6/30/82 | 82-1744 | 10/19/82 | |
| 83-05/5A | 201.7D | \$0.50 | Three Rivers Land Use | 6148 | 8/12/85 | 85-1381 | 10/1/85 | |
| 85-04B | 201.3E | Inc w/4A | Three Rivers Airport Site | 6232 | 2/26/86 | 86-475 | 4/15/86 | |
| 86-10 | 201.2F | N/A | Three Rivers Plan Amendment-Weaver | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 87-01 | 201.5F | \$0.30 | Three Rivers Land Use | 6403 | 7/22/87 | 87-1046 | 8/11/87 | |
| Three Rivers Continued | | | | | | | | |
| 87-14A | 201.3G | \$0.25 | Three Rivers Area Land Use | 7376/7 | 4/26/95 | | 6/27/95 | |
| 87-14B | 201.4G | \$0.20 | Three Rivers Community Plan Amendment | 6490 | 4/13/88 | 88-643 | 5/24/88 | |
| 90-02 | 250.21 | \$0.20 | Three Rivers Community Plan Amendment | 6518 | 6/8/88 | 88-1051 | 8/30/88 | |
| 94-03 | 201.6I | | Three Rivers Land Use, Thorn-Helgeson | 6927 | 8/14/91 | 91-1164 | 10/8/91 | |
| Traver | | | | | | | | |
| 89-01 | 250.2A | \$6.25 | Traver Community Plan | 6657 | 6/14/89 | 89-0947 | 7/18/89 | |
| 95-02 | | | Traver Community Plan Amendment | 7396 | 6/14/95 | | oct95 | |
| Urban Boundaries | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Tulare Urban Area Boundary | 3731 | 9/27/72 | 73-150 | 1/16/73 | GPA 75-1G |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Exeter Urban Area Boundary | 3715 | 9/13/72 | 73-34 | 1/9/73 | |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Farmersville Urban Area Boundary | 3716 | 9/13/72 | 73-152 | 1/16/73 | GPA 85-02 |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Dinuba Urban Area Boundary | 3714 | 9/13/72 | 73-35 | 1/9/73 | |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Woodlake Urban Area Boundary | 3719 | 9/13/72 | 73-32 | 1/9/73 | GPA 78-3B |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Visalia Urban Area Boundary | 3730 | 9/27/72 | 73-151 | 1/16/73 | |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Lindsay Urban Area Boundary | 3717 | 9/13/72 | 73-36 | 1/9/73 | GPA 85-01 |
| 1973 | 208.1 | N/A | Porterville Urban Area Boundary | 3718 | 9/13/72 | 73-33 | 1/9/73 | GPA 78-1A |
| 1974 | 208.8 | N/A | Lemon Cove Urban Area Boundary | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 1974 | 208.2 | \$5.00 | Urban Boundaries Element | 4081 | 3/13/74 | 74-1924 | 7/2/74 | Portion by GPAs 78-3B, 80-02, 81-03, 81-06, 82-04, 83-04A/B, 85-01, 85-02, 85-05, 86-06, 87-06, 87-07, 88-01, 89-06, 92-07A, 94-06 |
| 74-2E | 208.3 | Inc. w/2A | Alpaugh Urban Area Boundary | 4194 | 6/26/74 | 74-2923 | 10/22/74 | |
| 75-1G | 208.4 | N/A | Tulare Urban Area Boundary | 4242 | 8/28/74 | 75-3680 | 11/26/75 | GPA's 80-02, 94-06 |
| 76-5 | 208.5 | N/A | Springville Urban Area Boundary | 4503 | 11/16/75 | 76-2043 | 7/27/76 | Springville Community Plan |
| 76-7A | 208.6 | N/A | Farmersville Urban Area Boundary | 4641 | 6/23/76 | 76-3530 | 12/28/76 | GPA 85-02 |
| 78-1A | 208.6 | N/A | Porterville Urban Area Boundary | 4719 | 10/6/76 | 78-2411 | 9/12/78 | GPA 82-04 |
| 78-1B | 208.7 | N/A | Earlimart Urban Area Boundary | 5102 | 7/26/78 | 78-2480 | 9/19/78 | GPA 79-01 |
| 79-01 | 208.9 | N/A | Earlimart Urban Area Boundary | 5111 | 8/9/78 | 79-2784 | 10/30/79 | GPA 81-06 |
| 81-06 | 208.2A | N/A | Modification of the Earlimart UAB | 5317 | 8/8/79 | 82-431 | 3/16/82 | Earlimart Community Plan |
| 82-02 | 208.3A | N/A | Terra Bella Urban Area Boundary | 5769 | 2/10/82 | Unknown-Initiated by PC | | |
| 83-04A | 208.4A | \$0.70 | Amendment to Goals and Policies | 5934 | 6/8/83 | 83-949 | 7/5/83 | |
| 83-04B | 208.5A | \$0.70 | Visalia Urban Development Boundary | Not Adopted | | 83-1323 | 9/27/83 | Map by GPA 86-06, 92-07A |
| 85-01 | 208.6A | \$0.80 | Lindsay Urban Boundaries | 6149 | 6/12/85 | 85-1019 | 7/9/85 | |
| 85-02 | 208.7A | \$0.50 | Farmersville Urban Boundaries | 6167 | 7/24/85 | 85-1257 | 9/3/85 | |
| 85-05 | 208.8A | \$0.25 | Woodlake Urban Boundaries | 6236 | 3/12/86 | 86-498 | 4/15/86 | |
| 86-05 | 207.7E | \$0.25 | Dinuba LU, UAB, and UDB | Not Adopted | | Not Adopted | | |
| 86-06 | 208.9A | \$0.25 | Visalia Urban Development Boundary | 6286 | 8/27/86 | 86-1215 | 9/23/86 | |
| 88-01 | 208.1B | \$0.70 | Urban Boundaries Element | 6467 | 2/24/88 | 88-332 | 3/22/88 | Portion by GPA 89-03 |

List of General Plan Elements and Amendments by Subject

| Year | File # | Price | Element/Amendment | PC Resolution # | PC Resolution Date | BOS Resolution # | BOS Resolution Date | Superseded or Amended By: |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| GPA | | | | | | | | |
| 92-07A | | | Visalia, Goshen, Patterson Tract Urban Boundaries Amendment | 7319 | 11/30/94 | 95-0002 | 1/3/95 | |
| 93-02 | 208.3B | | Pixley Urban Boundaries Amendment | 7200 | 12/15/93 | | 6/14/94 | |
| 94-06 | 208.5B | | Tulare Urban Boundaries Amendment | 7378 | 4/26/95 | | 6/27/95 | |
| Water and Liquid Waste Management | | | | | | | | |
| 1972 | 216.8 | \$33.75 | Water and Liquid Waste Management | 3675 | 6/20/72 | 72-2174 | 6/27/72 | |
| 1973 | 201.5 | \$2.00 | Mooney Boulevard Corridor Concepts | 3838 3908 | 3/14/73 5/30/73 | 73-1814 | 6/12/73 | |

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

TULARE COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT CONSTRAINTS TO THE PROVISION OF HOUSING 1994 ANNUAL REPORT

Many factors combine to constrain the production of an adequate amount of housing at an affordable price. Some factors attributed to this situation include operation of the private market system, government regulation of the private market system, and actual physical limitations of land, infrastructure and services which support housing development. Further complicating the issue are governmental regulations imposed at several different levels (city, county, regional, state and federal) the higher levels over which a county government has no jurisdiction.

The ability of the County to carry out programs which provide or improve housing will continue to be dependent on the availability of Federal and State grants and local funds. The availability of County funds and staff, as well as County priorities, will obviously determine the ultimate implementation date of each program. No program in the Housing Element is intended to commit the County to expend unavailable resources. In addition to the contingency on County resources, implementation of all programs is subject to a current trade-off analysis that considers social, economic and environmental impacts.

This report has been prepared to fulfill the requirements of California Government Code Section 65400(b) to address local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (C) of the California Government Code Section 65583. Tulare County Housing Element Programs as contained in Chapter VI are listed and a status report on the implementation of those programs follows each program.

A program specifies the procedures which implement the policy. Listed under each program are the agency or agencies responsible for implementation and the time frame in which each program is proposed to be commenced and/or completed.

Program:

- 1.12 Develop criteria for sites appropriate for large family rental housing and identify such sites; develop incentives for this type of development such as density bonuses, other tradeoffs (such as revised improvement requirements), and development agreements. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to incorporate these criteria.

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Immediate and ongoing

The County has implemented Density Bonus allowances, as well as provisions incorporated into the Planned Unit Development standards contained in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff is currently reviewing Density Bonus Ordinances prepared by San Luis Obispo and Fresno Counties to assist in the preparation of a Density Bonus Ordinance for Tulare County.

A Draft Density Bonus Ordinance Issues Report has been completed . The following short term goals have been developed, 1) Check with CSAC, APA PAS, and BIA for good working examples of successful Density Bonus Ordinances, 2) Develop a strategy for long term affordability (coordinate with TC Housing Authority), 3) Contact the State HCD to determine whether the median income minimum of \$29,000 can be lowered to agree with the census estimate \$24,450, 3) Develop expanded Density Bonus Ordinance Informal working group to include SPRC members, 4) Check with the Tulare County Fire Marshall to evaluate how higher densities may impact fire flow requirements. Monitor legislation regarding Housing Element Reform.

Program:

- 1.61 Continue present practices which do not discourage the use of modular units, prefabricated units and mobile homes.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

The County has continued present practices which do not discourage the use of modular housing units and prefabricated units as long as they are placed on a permanent foundation, and mobile homes as allowed by the County Zoning Ordinance.

Program:

- 1.71 At the discretion of the Planning Director, form a task force of private sector advisors to review County permit processing and make suggestions for streamlining. In performing this task, the task force should:

compare County permit processing with other Counties and the cities in the County;

Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing

- . seek technical assistance from the State Office of Permit Assistance; and
- . review the list of ministerial and discretionary projects to determine whether more residential projects could be handled at an administrative level.

Responsible Agency: Board of Supervisors
Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: To meet as needed at the discretion of the Planning Director

Projects are streamlined through the "fast-tracking" process, as well as through the internal departmental review of projects to optimize staff resources and to process multiple projects concurrently.

Program:

- 1.72 Reduce application and plan checking fees for any housing project developed by public or private nonprofit agencies that includes a percentage of total units for lower income households.

Responsible Agencies: Board of Supervisors
Planning and Development Department
Public Works Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: Propose development of an ordinance for review by Board of Supervisors during Fiscal Year 1996-97.

Scheduled in F.Y. 1996/97 Work Program.

Program:

- 1.73 Continue the present practice of seeking public input whenever proposals are made to establish new fees or increase existing fees.

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
Public Works Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

The County has continued to seek public input whenever proposals are made to establish new fees or increase existing fees through the public hearing process.

Program:

- 1.74 Evaluate a "fast-track" option to process applications for low- and moderate-income housing projects.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: 1996-1997

Scheduled in F.Y. 1996/97 Work Program.

Program:

- 5.11 Review the zoning of "skipped-over" vacant lands in unincorporated communities to insure that present zoning is not impeding their development.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Prepare in conjunction with community plans and rezoning studies.

Rezoning for the Community of Alpaugh (PZ 93-014) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in April 1994. Staff is currently developing a Community Plan for Pixley (GPA 92-006). Upon completion of the Pixley Community Plan, staff anticipates beginning work on the Poplar-Cotton Center Community Plan. In addition, staff expects to complete the Traver Community Plan Rezoning, and Cutler-Orosi Specific Plan area rezoning during this calendar year.

Program:

- 5.21 Approve subdivisions and divisions of land for housing development when such proposals are consistent with adopted plans.

Responsible Agencies: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

Time Frame: Ongoing

The County has continued to approve subdivisions and divisions of land for housing development when such proposals are consistent with adopted plans and ordinances.

Program:

- 5.41 Systematically review existing community plans and zoning to assure that new community plans provide adequate residentially-designated sites.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Include such information in annual reports required by Government Code Section 65400.

This program is implemented during the preparation of community plans, rezoning studies and redevelopment plans.

- 5.42 Continue to prepare master environmental assessments for specific community plans in order to streamline environmental assessments on individual projects.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

The County has prepared a master environmental impact report for the West Exeter Specific Plan, which will streamline environmental assessments on individual projects located within the plan area.

- 5.43 Review and revise, where appropriate, the urban boundaries of unincorporated communities.

Responsible Agencies: Tulare County Association of Governments
Planning and Development Department,
Countywide Planning Division

Time Frame: Schedule completion of a report in Fiscal Year 1992-93, following completion of the Urban Boundaries Plan review for unincorporated cities.

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

A Planner III staff position was allocated through TCAG, and filled in 1992 to prepare an update to the Urban Boundaries Element. Projected completion of the Element is during Calendar Year 1995. A comprehensive amendment to the Visalia urban boundaries was adopted by the Tulare County Planning Commission on November 30, 1994.

Program:

5.51 Streamline the Site Plan review process by making the following revisions:

- . reduce the amount of information which must be submitted for minor projects; and
- . incorporate a final site plan waiver procedure

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: Fiscal Year 1996-97

Scheduled in F.Y. 1996/97 Work Program.

Program:

6.12 Review the Zoning Ordinance to determine whether existing regulations place unnecessary constraints on the development of convalescent homes and other continuous care facilities.

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

No applications for convalescent homes or continuous care facilities have been submitted during the plan period.

Program:

6.21 Review the Zoning Ordinance to evaluate farm labor camps as a permitted use in appropriate zones, and adopt standards for approval.

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

Responsible Agencies: Board of Supervisors
Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Prepare a report for consideration by the Board of Supervisors during Fiscal Year 1996-97.

Farm labor camps are allowed in designated agricultural zones with Special Use Permit approval.

Program:

- 10.31 Continue efforts to amend the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances to allow higher densities, zero lot line development and other, more flexible, zoning provisions.

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: Fiscal Year 1996-97

Scheduled in F.Y. 1996/97 Work Program.

- 10.32 Prepare and adopt a Density Bonus Ordinance consistent with State Density Bonus Law.

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: By June 31, 1993

The County has implemented Density Bonus allowances, as well as provisions incorporated into the Planned Unit Development standards contained in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff is currently reviewing Density Bonus Ordinances prepared by San Luis Obispo and Fresno Counties to assist in the preparation of a Density Bonus Ordinance for Tulare County.

A Draft Density Bonus Ordinance Issues Report has been completed. The following short term goals have been developed, 1) Check with CSAC, APA PAS, and BIA for good working examples of successful Density Bonus Ordinances, 2) Develop a strategy for long term affordability (coordinate with TC Housing Authority), 3) Contact the State HCD to determine whether the median income minimum of \$29,000 can be lowered to agree with the census estimate \$24,450, 3) Develop expanded Density Bonus Ordinance Informal working group to include SPRC members, 4) Check with the Tulare County Fire Marshall to evaluate how higher

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

densities may impact fire flow requirements. Monitor legislation regarding Housing Element Reform.

Program:

- 10.41 Make developers, builders and the public aware of changes which have been made or are under consideration and increase the County's public relations efforts.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

The County has continued to utilize fliers and other public relations efforts in order to make developers, builders and the public aware of changes which have been made or are under consideration.

Program:

- 10.42 Preparation of annual reports which enumerate new ordinances; policy and standard revisions undertaken during the previous year and review of accomplishments.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

Annual reports are prepared and reviewed by the Board of Supervisors.

Program:

- 10.43 Include a more detailed analysis of pros and cons and likely results of ordinance amendments in Planning and Development Department staff reports.

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: To be agreed upon between school districts and the Board of Supervisors at the time the districts request approval of additional school fees.

Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing

The County continues to evaluate alternatives when proposing any ordinance amendments. The County initiates the formation of committees, when appropriate, to advise on proposed Ordinance amendments.

Program:

- 10.51 A complete study is now in progress to evaluate the impact of additional school fees and develop recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to reduce the impact on low income households, encourage greater uniformity of fees, and correct existing inequities (e.g., charging fees for rebuilding units destroyed by fire, for senior citizen housing projects, etc.).

Responsible Agencies: Planning and Development Department
County Counsel

Time Frame: To be agreed upon between school districts and the
Board of Supervisors at the time school districts
request approval of additional school fees.

Individual school districts are now responsible for the implementation of school fees as a result of AB 2926.

Program:

- 10.52 Encourage school districts to pursue financial measures such as the one approved by the City of Tulare, which balances costs between new and existing residents, and all other alternatives prior to requesting the Board of Supervisors to impose additional school impact fees.

Responsible Agencies: Board of Supervisors
School Districts
County Counsel

Time Frame: To be agreed upon between school districts and the
Board of Supervisors at the time school districts
request approval of additional school fees.

Individual school districts are now responsible for the implementation of school fees as a result of AB 2926.

Program:

- 10.53 Investigate methods to reduce, provide for extended payment periods, and/or subsidize school impact fees for households below the poverty level.

Responsible Agencies: County Counsel
School Districts
Planning and Development Department,
Redevelopment and Grants Division

Time Frame: Prepare report for consideration by the Board of Supervisors by 1996.

Scheduled in F.Y. 1995/96 Work Program.

Program:

- 10.61 Continue to amend the Zoning Ordinance as appropriate to include written standards for permits for which no written standards currently exist, in order to reduce the number of discretionary permits.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

The County has continued to amend the Zoning Ordinance in order to include written standards for permits, for which written standards do not currently exist.

Program:

- 12.21 Implement the County Service Area as a vehicle for maintaining privately-developed public facilities for new subdivisions in unincorporated communities.

Responsible Agency: Board of Supervisors

Time Frame: Ongoing.

Two County Service Areas have been established for infrastructure and fire protection related services. In the future, additional services may be provided upon approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Specific infrastructure improvements include the following:

*Tulare County Planning and Development Department
1992 Housing Element
Chapter IV, Constraints to the Provision of Housing*

Time Frame: Ongoing.

No occasion has arisen in which this opportunity could be utilized. Assessments may be utilized to develop water system improvements in Sierra King.

Program:

- 12.31 Identify target areas for public infrastructure assistance, based on a countywide needs assessment, housing condition surveys, and other relevant information.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Development Department,
Redevelopment and Grants Division

Time Frame: Ongoing.

Work funded by 1992 and 1993 general allocation (30-month) Community Development Block Grants continues. Both grants funded housing rehabilitation in Poplar, Cotton Center and Terra Bella. Sewer hook-ups in Poplar were accomplished with the 1992 grant, which is now ready for close-out. Sewer connections in Tonyville and water connections in Yettem will be funded with the 1993 grant.

Three 1994 Community Development Block Grants have been received:

The \$500,000 general allocation grant will be used to build a new fire station in Doyle Colony, ensuring that housing and other buildings in the unincorporated East Porterville community receive adequate fire protection. The grant application was prepared through a \$30,000 CDBG technical assistance grant that also included an income survey of Doyle Colony and preliminary architectural and engineering studies.

A \$30,000 12-month technical assistance grant will be used to do housing condition surveys in El Rancho, Pixley, Teviston, Tonyville, Tooleville and Yettem and to prepare a 1995 CDGB general allocation grant application to do housing rehabilitation in those communities. It will fund an affordable housing study (examining particularly land use and zoning) in Seville, Tonyville, Yettem and Poplar. It will also be used to prepare an application for a grant funded by the Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME).

A \$30,000 technical assistance grant will pay for a Focused Target Industries Study. The study will be used to attract industries to Tulare County and generate more jobs.

A \$1 million HOME grant has been used to help fund construction of a low-income 35-unit apartment complex in Richgrove by Self-Help Enterprises, and to rehabilitate 10 homes in all

Traver.

Landscaping projects to beautify the Highway 99 interchanges in Earlimart, Goshen and Traver will be pursued as grant funds become available from the California Department of Transportation.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX D

Date: May 9, 1995

Division of Codes and Standards

1800 Third Street, Suite 260

P. O. Box 1407

Sacramento, CA 95812-1407

(916) 445-9471, FAX (916) 327-4712

Attention: Bruce McKarley

Employee Housing Program Manager

Enforcement Agency: Tulare County Planning
and Development Department

Address: County Civic Center
Room 105 - Court House

Visalia, CA 93291-4593

Contact Person: Catherine Andersen

Telephone Number: 209-733-6282

Employee Housing Statistics Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Sections 17031.8 and 17056

January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | Number of current permits issued See attachment #1 | 0 issued by county 25 issued by state to local jurisdiction facilities 38 issued by state to local jurisdiction facilities |
| 2. | Number of past year permits issued See attachment #2 | |
| 3. | Number and *location of employee housing facilities See attachment #3 | See attached print out |
| 4. | Number and *location of employee housing facilities found operating without a permit See attachment #4 | 23 facilities found by Tulare County |
| 5. | Number and *location of inactive employee housing facilities See attachment #5 | 23 inactive facilities |
| 6. | Number of previously inactive employee housing facilities | State has this information |
| 7. | Number of occupants residing in the inactive employee housing facilities when they were last occupied | State has this information |
| 8. | Number of preoccupancy inspections | 6 by Tulare County |
| 9. | Number of occupancy inspections | -0- |
| 10. | Number of reinspections | -0- |
| 11. | A schedule of permits fees charged | |
| | a. Issuance Fee | \$ 100.00 |
| | b. Employee Fee | \$ 12.00 |
| 12. | Total amount of permit fees collected | \$ 4,268.00 |
| 13. | Total amount of reinspection fees collected | \$ -0- |
| 14. | Total of all fines collected | \$ 8,128.00 |
| 15. | Total of all civil penalties collected | \$ -0- |
| 16. | The number of cases referred to the District Attorney | \$ -0- |

17. The number of cases filed 0
18. The number of prosecutions undertaken 0
19. The number of complaints received since the employee housing facility has been in operation 0
20. The character of the complaints (provide the number of each type listed below):
Attachment #6
- a. Fire and Safety (exiting and fire extinguishers) _____
 - b. Structural (roof, walls, floors, windows, doors, and screens) _____
 - c. Electrical (service, branch circuits, systems, and equipment) _____
 - d. Mechanical (gas piping, appliances, heating and cooling) _____
 - e. Plumbing (water, drain, sewer, and fixtures) _____
 - f. General (other) _____
 - g. Operating without a valid permit (illegal) _____
 - h. Total _____
21. The number of violations cited during routine inspections (do not include statistics from #19 and #20 in this category) 816
Attachment #6
22. The character of the violations cited (provide the number of each type listed below):
- a. Fire and Safety (exiting and fire extinguishers) 7
 - b. Structural (roof, walls, floors, windows, doors, and screens) 20
 - c. Electrical (service, branch circuits, systems, and equipment) 132
 - d. Mechanical (gas piping, appliances, heating and cooling) 92
 - e. Plumbing (water, drain, sewer, and fixtures) 119
 - f. General (other) 422
 - g. Operating without a valid permit (illegal) 23
23. The number of violations resulting in civil citations 0
24. The number of staff hours dedicated to the implementation of the Employee Housing Act 410.5 hrs.
25. The number and *location of employee housing facilities receiving an exemption *See attachment #7 for list of exempt facilities approved by State* 0 issued by County
26. The number of new permits issued this year 0 issued by County

* Use separate attachment for listing locations (addresses)

25 permits approved to be issued by State to Local Jurisdiction Facilities

24 permits actually issued by the State

- 1) 54-0010
- 2) 54-0014
- 3) 54-0046
- 4) 54-0078
- 5) 54-0086
- 6) 54-0107
- 7) 54-1030 (Exempt)
- 8) 54-1236
- 9) 54-1239
- 10) 54-1277 (Ok'd for PTO in 1994 - None issued?)
- 11) 54-1290
- 12) 54-1300
- 13) 54-1309
- 14) 54-1310
- 15) 54-1316
- 16) 54-1317
- 17) 54-1325
- 18) 54-1341
- 19) 54-1342
- 20) 54-1345
- 21) 54-1392
- 22) 54-1396
- 23) 54-1400
- 24) 54-1402
- 25) 54-1403

PTO's 1993 By State to Local Jurisdiction

54-0010
54-0013
54-0014
54-0034
54-0046
54-0078
54-0086
54-0107
54-1073
54-1216
54-1277
54-1288
54-1290
54-1299
54-1307
54-1308
54-1309
54-1310
54-1311
54-1317
54-1325
54-1349
54-1350
54-1360
54-1361
54-1375
54-1377
54-1380
54-1381
54-1386
54-1398
54-1400
54-1402
54-1403
54-1404
54-1407
54-1411
54-1412

Non-Operational '94

54-0015 Rd 156 1/2 m N. Ave 8, Delano
54-0079 6876 Ave 416, Dinuba
54-0955 9600 Rd 256, Terra Bella
54-1023 24487 Rd 140, Tulare
54-1024 4083 Ave 216, Tulare
54-1045 20180 Rd 36, Tulare
54-1303 12716 Alta, Cutler
54-1313 41235 Rd 128, Orosi
54-1348 262 Conner, Porterville
54-1354 40637 Lincoln, Cutler
54-1386 1537 E. Tyler, Porterville
54-1400 40654 Rd 84, Dinuba
54-1410 1353 E. Roby, Porterville

Closed

54-0032 35579 Rd 164, McFarland
54-0106 46216 Dry Creek Dr., Badger
54-0909 Road 168, Delano
54-1038 3515 Ave 228, Tulare
54-1059 35833 Rd 172, Ivanhoe
54-1086 15506 Rd 80, Tipton
54-1199 5515 Ave 120, Corcoran
54-1221 23343 Rd 60, Tulare
54-1301 12651 Ira Ave, Orosi
54-9049 21191 Rd 36, Tulare

